



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

5

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,747	09/25/2003	Il-Dong Park	P56942	4499

7590

11/17/2004

Robert E. Bushnell
Suite 300
1522 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

EXAMINER

MAI, TRI M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3727

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/669,747

Applicant(s)

PARK ET AL.

Examiner

Tri M. Mai

Art Unit

3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the unraveling in claims 4, and 9 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 3 and 16, "Kraft" is a trademark. The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product.

Art Unit: 3727

In fact, the value of a trademark would be lost to the extent that it became descriptive of a product, rather than used as an identification of a source or origin of a product. Thus, the use of a trademark or trade name in a claim to identify or describe a material or product would not only render a claim indefinite, but would also constitute an improper use of the trademark or trade name.

The term stack of paper is defined as "a pile" of paper. It seems that the term stack is used as "a blank".

It is unclear what strip is being folded as set forth in claim 1.

It is unclear what is meant by 300D/3 and 500D/3.

3. Claims 11, 16, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by either Levi(3370777) or Walter (1449467). Levi teaches a plurality of sheets of papers in Fig. 2, the sheets are joined by folding over a strip at portion 16, and a sewn thread at portion 58.

Walter teaches a container having portion 38 attached to the container by stitching.

4. Claims 1-9, 12, 13, 14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levi (3370777) in view of Plummer, III et al. (5545844). Plummer teaches that it is known in the art to provide nylon threads. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide nylon threads in Levi as taught by Plummer to provide the desired material for attaching the container.

Regarding claim the thread between 50-80 stitches per meter, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the coverage as set forth to provide the desired force needed for holding the sheets of paper together.

Art Unit: 3727

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the nylon thread between 300D/3 and 500D/3 to provide the desired thickness of the thread.

Regarding claim 4, as best understood, the thread in Levi can be unraveled as claimed.

Regarding claim 5, note the adhesive 54.

Regarding claim 6, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use adhesive including synthetic resin to provide the desired type of adhesive.

Regarding claim 8, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the adhesive before the adhesive fully dries to sew the thread easily.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levi rejection, as set forth above, in view of Bugnone (2933232). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the tab in Levi as taught by Bugnone to keep the thread visible and to unravel the attachment means easily.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levi rejection, as set forth in paragraph 4, and further in view of Miller, Jr. (2281854). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the thread joint by machinery in Levi as taught by Miller, Jr., to facilitate the sewing easily.

7. Claims 5-8, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter in view of Annen (2109716). Annen teaches that it is known in the art provide adhesive along with another fastening means (col. 2, ln. 9-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide adhesive in addition to threads in Geisler as taught by Annen to provide added strength.

Art Unit: 3727

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the adhesive being a synthetic resin to provide the desired adhesive for the container.

Regarding claim 8, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide sewing after the adhesive fully dries to keep adhesive from spreading, and to sew the various pieces easily.

8. Claims 1, 2, and 13-16, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter in view of Plummer, III. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the type of threads as claimed, e.g. nylon threads, in Walter as taught by Plummer to provide the desired thread for the container. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the thickness and the spacing to provide the desired type of stitching.

9. Claims 3, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter rejection, as set forth in paragraph 8, and further in view of Gardner. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use corrugated paper in Walter as taught by Gardner to provide the desired paper according to the need.


10. Claims 4, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Walter rejections as set forth above in paragraph 8, and further in view of Bugnone (2933232). Bugnone teaches that it is known in the art provide a tab at the end of a thread joint and thread is unravelable. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a tab at the end of a thread joint and thread is unravelable in Walter as taught by Bugnone to detach the various parts easily.

Art Unit: 3727

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tri M. Mai whose telephone number is (571)272-4541. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lee W Young can be reached on (571)272-4549. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tri M. Mai 
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3727